

Alternative Partnership Scenarios

FY2010 Current Levels		Average Grant Size
Partner Community Arts Program Grants	\$ 249,955	\$ 27,773
Organization AOS Grants (Estimated)	\$ 864,631	\$ 6,089
Majors Grants	\$ 592,040	\$ 45,542
Project APS Grants (Estimated)	\$ 397,100	\$ 1,900
Total RAP and Majors Grants for FY2010	\$ 2,103,726	
RAP Admin fee based on RBG	\$ 151,408	
RAP Services fees	\$ 192,000	
External Admin fees paid to RAP	\$ 343,408	

\$32,000 of this is in IAC budget this year for regions 8 and 12.

1. Regional Grants External, Services Centralized Internally: Regional Block grants will still be given through partnership. All other services (technical assistance, information referral and needs assessment) administered by IAC.

1. Regional Grants External, Services Centralized Internally		Average Grant Size
Partner Community Arts Program Grants	\$ 249,955	\$ 27,773
Organization AOS Grants	\$ 968,311	\$ 6,819
Majors Grants	\$ 632,360	\$ 48,643
Project APS Grants	\$ 397,100	\$ 1,900
Total RAP and Major Grants	\$ 2,247,726	
12% Fee still going to Partners	\$ 163,849	
External Admin fees paid to RAP	\$ 163,849	
Partner Community Arts Program Grants	\$ 249,955	\$ 27,773
Organization AOS Grants	\$ 1,365,411	\$ 9,616
Majors Grants	\$ 632,360	\$ 48,643
Total RAP and Major Grants	\$ 2,247,726	
12% Fee still going to Partners	\$ 163,849	
External Admin fees paid to RAP	\$ 163,849	
Gain from 12% Admin fee assessed to the new grant base	\$ (12,442)	
Net additional NEW funds for field	\$ 144,000	
New funds available for grants	\$ 131,558	

Adding funds to the grants administered by the partners causes an increase in their admin fee, as this represents.

This represents the amount currently given to the partners (\$192,000) minus the amount (\$48,000) the IAC needs to administer the technical services.

This represents the new funds available minus the extra admin fees needed for partners to administer more grant funds.

Positives

- Services would be more consistent throughout the State
- Generally, services could be of a higher quality with economy of scale, ability to shop for products of national reputation, etc.
- Partners generally have good systems for paneling and administering grants
- The rural reach of our granting programs remains intact
- The involvement of local people remains intact
- The “hassles” of processing all grants through the State systems is avoided
- Local advocacy network as promoted/cultivated by our partners remains intact
- Fewer IAC staff issues than other scenarios

Negatives

- Does not address the presently costly system of administering the block grants
- Grant processes are currently not consistent, and this scenario does not address that
- Does not address the sometimes local bias in the granting process
- Does not allow the IAC to establish relationships with many fundees
- Fairly inefficient system of administering grants in an environment which is demanding efficiency
- Planning and information referral less relevant on a State rather than regional level

2. Grants Centralized Internally, Services Remain External: Regional block grants are no longer given, and all granting is done centrally through the IAC. All other services (technical assistance, information referral and needs assessment) still provided by regional partners.

2. Grants Centralized Internally, Services Remain External		Average Grant Size
Partner Community Arts Program Grants	\$ 249,955	\$ 27,773
Organization AOS Grants	\$ 905,245	\$ 6,375
Majors Grants	\$ 607,834	\$ 46,756
Project APS Grants	\$ 397,100	\$ 1,900
Total RAP and Major Grants	\$ 2,160,134	
Services funding still going to Partners	\$ 192,000	
External Admin fees paid to RAP	\$ 192,000	
Partner Community Arts Program Grants	\$ 249,955	\$ 27,773
Organization AOS Grants	\$ 1,302,345	\$ 9,171
Majors Grants	\$ 607,834	\$ 46,756
Total RAP and Major Grants	\$ 2,160,134	
Services funding still going to Partners	\$ 192,000	
External Admin fees paid to RAP	\$ 192,000	
Net additional NEW funds for field	\$ 56,408	
New funds available for grants	\$ 56,408	

This represents the amount currently given to the partners (\$151,408) minus the amount (\$95,000) the IAC needs to administer the grant system.

Positives

- One grant application process for all applicants statewide – efficiency and consistency
- Partners can be more in touch with what services are needed locally, and this remains intact
- Maintains a significant element of cultural needs assessment/planning on a local level
- It will cost less to evaluate grants
- Efficiency of scale – fewer grant panels and accompanying administration statewide
- All grants will now be electronic – eventually smaller associated administrative costs
- Possibility of building a stronger advocacy group with some amount of technical assistance through them
- IAC reestablishes a direct granting relationship with arts organizations in the State

Negatives

- Disconnect between grants and services – grants (categories, etc.) should be in response to local needs, etc.
- Administration of services is not necessarily many partners' current strength
- Fewer local people involved in the decision making/evaluation of grants
- "Urban" myth might be perpetuated –the IAC being in Indianapolis, only really cares about that region
- Less local ownership of how monies are allocated
- Rural disconnect
- The internal process of the State system is cumbersome, and will increase the affect of the State bureaucracy

3A & 3B Hybrid Systems with Fewer Partners (5 regions being Central, Northeast, Northwest, Southeast and Southwest, or 4 quadrants and 4 urban centers being Gary, Ft. Wayne, Indianapolis and Evansville): Some regional grants and services still provided by regional or local partner. Some technical services and more operational grants (above a certain applicant budget level) taken centrally by the IAC.

3A. Hybrid Partner Systems		Average Grant Size
3A. Five Region Hybrid (Central, Northeast, Northwest, Southeast, and Southwest)		
Partner Community Arts Program Grants	\$ -	
Organization AOS II Grants	\$ 450,758	\$ 8,838
Organization AOS I Grants	\$ 767,508	\$ 8,434
Majors Grants	\$ 632,360	\$ 48,643
Project APS Grants	\$ 397,100	\$ 1,900
Total RAP and Majors Grants for FY2010	\$ 2,247,726	
RAP Admin fee based on RBG	\$ 139,753	
External Admin fees paid to RAP	\$ 139,753	
Gain from 12% Admin fee assessed to the new grant base	\$ 11,655	
Net additional NEW funds for field	\$ 144,000	
New funds available for grants	\$ 155,655	
<hr/>		
Partner Community Arts Program Grants	\$ -	\$ -
Organization AOS II Grants	\$ 597,685	\$ 11,719
Organization AOS I Grants	\$ 1,017,681	\$ 11,183
Majors Grants	\$ 632,360	\$ 48,643
Total RAP and Majors Grants for FY2010	\$ 2,247,726	
RAP Admin fee based on RBG	\$ 122,122	
External Admin fees paid to RAP	\$ 122,122	
Gain from 12% Admin fee assessed to the new grant base	\$ 29,286	
Net additional grant funds for field	\$ 144,000	
New funds available for grants	\$ 173,286	

Because the IAC will administer the AOS II grants, funds are gained from admin fees that were normally paid to the partners.

This represents the amount currently given to the partners (\$192,000) minus the amount (\$48,000) the IAC needs to administer the technical services.

This represents the new funds available plus the extra admin fees gained from the partners by handling more grants internally.

Because the IAC will administer the AOS II grants, funds are gained from admin fees that were normally paid to the partners.

This represents the amount currently given to the partners (\$192,000) minus the amount (\$48,000) the IAC needs to administer the technical services.

This represents the new funds available plus the extra admin fees gained from the partners by handling more grants internally.

3B. Hybrid Partner Systems CONTINUED		Average Grant Size
3B. Eight Region Hybrid (4 quad plus urban; Gary, Ft. Wayne, Indpls, Evansville)		
Partner Community Arts Program Grants	\$ 222,182	\$ 27,773
Organization AOS II Grants	\$ 368,551	\$ 7,226
Organization AOS I Grants	\$ 627,533	\$ 6,896
Majors Grants	\$ 632,360	\$ 48,643
Project APS Grants	\$ 397,100	\$ 1,900
Total RAP and Majors Grants for FY2010	\$ 2,247,726	
RAP Admin fee based on RBG	\$ 122,956	
External Admin fees paid to RAP	\$ 122,956	
Gain from 12% Admin fee assessed to the new grant base	\$ 28,452	
Net additional grant funds for field	\$ 144,000	
New funds available for grants	\$ 172,452	
Partner Community Arts Program Grants	\$ 222,182	\$ 27,773
Organization AOS II Grants	\$ 515,478	\$ 10,107
Organization AOS I Grants	\$ 877,706	\$ 9,645
Majors Grants	\$ 632,360	\$ 48,643
Total RAP and Majors Grants for FY2010	\$ 2,247,726	
RAP Admin fee based on RBG	\$ 105,325	
External Admin fees paid to RAP	\$ 105,325	
Gain from 12% Admin fee assessed to the new grant base	\$ 46,083	
Net additional grant funds for field	\$ 144,000	
New funds available for grants	\$ 190,083	

The IAC will administer the AOS II grants so funds are gained from admin fees that were normally paid to the partners. More funds are gained here than in part A. because less money is placed in the AOS I category due to the community arts program grants that are still intact for the 8 remaining partners.

This represents the amount currently given to the partners (\$192,000) minus the amount (\$48,000) the IAC needs to administer the technical services.

This represents the new funds available plus the extra admin fees gained from the partners by handling more grants internally.

The IAC will administer the AOS II grants so funds are gained from admin fees that were normally paid to the partners. More funds are gained here than in part A. because less money is placed in the AOS I category due to the community arts program grants that are still intact for the 8 remaining partners.

This represents the amount currently given to the partners (\$192,000) minus the amount (\$48,000) the IAC needs to administer the technical services.

This represents the new funds available plus the extra admin fees gained from the partners by handling more grants internally.

Positives

- More competitive for partners/more accountability
- Could take central some statewide, higher end services
- Could take central grants of organizations over X dollars
- Greater efficiency for the IAC
- More overall savings
- Fewer partners to supervise

Negatives

- Consistency to the field?
- It might break the regional mission of many of our partners
- What partners would want this "deal"
- Overwhelming task for 4 rural quadrants
- Breaks existing advocacy system

4. Entirely Centralized, as IAC was prior to the regional system: All grants and services directly administered by the IAC.

4. Entirely Centralized		Average Grant Size
Partner Community Arts Program Grants	\$ -	\$ -
Organization AOS Grants	\$ 1,258,880	\$ 8,865
Majors Grants	\$ 648,154	\$ 49,858
Project APS Grants	\$ 397,100	\$ 1,900
Total RAP and Major Grants	\$ 2,304,134	
Partner Community Arts Program Grants	\$ -	\$ -
Organization AOS Grants	\$ 1,655,980	\$ 11,662
Majors Grants	\$ 648,154	\$ 49,858
Total RAP and Major Grants	\$ 2,304,134	
Net additional NEW funds for field	\$ 200,408	
New funds available for grants	\$ 200,408	

This represents the amount currently given to the partners (\$151,408) minus the amount (\$95,000) the IAC needs to administer the grant system plus the amount currently given to the partners (\$192,000) minus the amount (\$48,000) the IAC needs to administer the technical

Positives

- Greater efficiency
- More overall savings
- More direct relationship with organizations throughout the state and greater control by IAC of its services, processes, etc.
- Electronic/on-line centralization of many processes and services

Negatives

- Lack of sufficient staff or possibility of increasing staff
- Less local decision making, local involvement, local expertise, and possible degradation of advocacy network
- The IAC would be less "in the hands" of the citizens of our State

5. Status Quo: All grants and services remain the same.

5. Status Quo		Average Grant Size
Partner Community Arts Program Grants	\$ 249,955	\$ 27,773
Organization AOS Grants (Estimated)	\$ 864,631	\$ 6,089
Majors Grants	\$ 592,040	\$ 45,542
Project APS Grants (Estimated)	\$ 397,100	\$ 1,900
Total RAP and Majors Grants for FY2010	\$ 2,103,726	
RAP Admin fee based on RBG	\$ 151,408	
RAP Services fees	\$ 192,000	
External Admin fees paid to RAP	\$ 343,408	
<hr/>		
Partner Community Arts Program Grants	\$ 249,955	\$ 27,773
Organization AOS Grants	\$ 1,261,731	\$ 8,885
Majors Grants	\$ 592,040	\$ 45,542
Total RAP and Majors Grants for FY2010	\$ 2,103,726	
RAP Admin fee based on RBG	\$ 151,408	
RAP Services fees	\$ 192,000	
External Admin fees paid to RAP	\$ 343,408	
Net additional NEW funds for field	\$ -	
New funds available for grants	\$ -	

Because all services and total grants remain the same, there are no new additional funds to be gained in this scenario.

Positives

- For partners who have built organizational strength around the core requirements, it has been a strategy for stability and growth
- Built a strong advocacy network around the State
- Involvement of many citizens in IAC decision/services
- Built an effective partnership among Commissioners, partners and legislators
- Sense of “ownership” of the IAC and the State processes by constituents

Negatives

- Overlap of local and regional missions sometimes problematic
- Overlap of not-for-profit and public missions sometimes problematic
- Inconsistency of IAC services, both amount and quality from region to region
- Lack of delivery of all core services in all regions
- Complacency by local boards with regard to local fundraising responsibilities
- Sometimes a sense of organizational entitlement rather than citizen entitlement
- Lack of attention to rural constituents, especially in “urban” regions
- Not efficient from a financial standpoint (economies of scale)
- For the IAC, not a direct relationship with most grantees in the State